

1 LAURA VARTAIN HORN (SBN: 258485)
laura.vartain@kirkland.com
2 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
555 California Street, 30th Floor
3 San Francisco, CA 94104
4 Telephone: (415) 439-1625

5 ALLISON M. BROWN (admitted Pro Hac Vice)
allison.brown@kirkland.com
6 JESSICA DAVIDSON (admitted Pro Hac Vice)
jessica.davidson@kirkland.com
7 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
601 Lexington Avenue
8 New York, NY 10022
9 Telephone: (212) 446-4723

10 *Attorneys for Defendants*
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
11 RASIER, LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC

12 *[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

16 IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
17 PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
18 LITIGATION

19 This Document Relates to:
20 ALL ACTIONS

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES,
INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC's
UNOPPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO SHORTEN BRIEFING
SCHEDULE ON MOTION TO ENFORCE
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer
Courtroom: 6 - 17th Floor

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3, Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC (“Defendants”) hereby submit this administrative motion to shorten time for briefing on their Motion to Enforce Protective Order (“Motion”). The interested parties conferred and agreed that a reasonable briefing schedule for the Motion being filed July 18, 2025 is: (a) Response from Mr. Stanley and/or the PSC by July 25, 2025; and (b) Defendants’ reply by July 29, 2025. *See generally*, Exhibit A, Declaration of Veronica Hayes Gromada (“Gromada Dec.”), ¶2. Therefore, the relief sought herein relating to the proposed briefing schedule of the Motion is unopposed.

This relief is necessary to stop ongoing harm.

ARGUMENT

Reasons for the requested shortening of time. Defendants filed a Motion to Enforce Protective Order to stop ongoing violations of the Protective Order by Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee (“PSC”) member Bret Stanley. *See generally*, Exhibit A, Gromada Dec. Mr. Stanley created a spreadsheet detailing 587 of Defendants’ internal policy related resources and identifying the repository location (or internal company “homepage”) in which each resource is stored (the “October 2024 Spreadsheet”). Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶¶4-5.

Mr. Stanley admittedly identified this information by reviewing the content of Confidential and Highly Confidential/Attorneys’ Eyes Only (“AEO”) documents produced in the MDL. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶¶6-8. Mr. Stanley is now using the October 2024 Spreadsheet to propound abusive discovery in other cases unrelated to the MDL or JCCP (for example single-plaintiff motor vehicle accident cases) brought against Defendants. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶¶9-13. Mr. Stanley has also violated the Protective Order by disclosing the October 2024 Spreadsheet (and the confidential material that sheet contains) to other plaintiffs’ counsel who are not counsel of record in the MDL or JCCP and who are prosecuting unrelated non-MDL and non-JCCP cases against Defendants. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶¶9-13, 18-19.

The Parties conferred in an attempt to resolve this dispute on June 30, 2025. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶14. In an effort to avoid immediate motion practice despite an apparent impasse, on July 8,

1 2025, Defendants proposed an “agreement to disagree” through which Mr. Stanley would “confirm
2 that the only cases in which the names of [Defendants’] policies identified in the MDL have been used
3 [by Mr. Stanley] are the *Smith* and *Lord* cases identified in our letter” and “agree that before using the
4 names of [Defendants’] policies or other information from confidential documents identified in the
5 MDL in any other case, [Mr. Stanley] will seek either [Defendants’] permission or permission from
6 the MDL Court.” Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶15.

7 On July 11, 2025, Mr. Stanley rejected Defendants’ proposal. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶16.
8 However, Mr. Stanley also “confirm[ed] that the only matters I have made requests for production of
9 KB Policies / Articles specifically by name are the Smith and Lord matters.” *Id.*

10 That same day, Defendants learned that Mr. Stanley’s co-counsel in a case unrelated to the
11 MDL or JCCP, *Lord v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al*, filed on the public docket a discovery request
12 that attaches a 22-page spreadsheet listing by name 891 of Defendants’ internal company policy related
13 resources, 473 of which were identified by Mr. Stanley in Confidential and Highly Confidential/AEO
14 MDL documents. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶17. Defendants also learned that another attorney with the
15 law firm of Mr. Stanley’s *Lord* co-counsel had previously issued a nearly identical discovery request
16 in yet another case, *Casey Jones v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*, thus reflecting disclosure to yet
17 another third party of confidential information covered by the Protective Order. Ex. A, Gromada Dec.,
18 ¶18.

19 In addition, on July 11, 2025, the same day Mr. Stanley confirmed “that the only matters I have
20 made requests for production of KB Policies / Articles specifically by name are the Smith and Lord
21 matters,” counsel in *yet another case* against Defendants, *Soto v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*,
22 propounded a request for production nearly identical to the *Lord* and *Jones* requests. Ex. A, Gromada
23 Dec., ¶¶16, 19. Thus, Mr. Stanley’s October 2024 Spreadsheet is apparently “making the rounds” and
24 being further disseminated among other plaintiffs’ counsel who are not permitted to have this
25 information in cases unrelated to the MDL or JCCP. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶19. An expedited ruling
26 on the underlying dispute is therefore required to prevent further dissemination of the information at
27 issue and related harm to Defendants. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶20.

1 *Meet and confer efforts to obtain a stipulation.* On July 17, 2025, Defendants emailed
 2 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee ("PSC") member, Bret Stanley, and other members of the PSC,
 3 including the co-leads, requesting a conferral regarding a proposed shortened briefing schedule on
 4 Defendants' Motion to Enforce. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶2. A conferral by video conference occurred
 5 on July 18, 2025. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶2. Mr. Stanley appeared on the conferral and represented
 6 that he had previously conferred with the PSC and that the PSC had authorized him to request 7 days
 7 to respond to the Motion to Enforce on the PSC's behalf. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶2. Mr. Stanley also
 8 requested that any response to the Motion to Enforce that he may submit also be submitted within 7
 9 days. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶2. The parties also agreed that Defendants' reply would be due four days
 10 thereafter. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶2. Having reached agreement, immediately following the conferral,
 11 Defendants sent an email to Mr. Stanley and the PSC confirming the Parties' agreement to the
 12 proposed briefing schedule: (a) Motion to Enforce to be filed July 18, 2025; (b) response from Mr.
 13 Stanley and/or the PSC by July 25, 2025; (c) Defendants' reply due July 29, 2025. Ex. A, Gromada
 14 Dec., ¶2. Mr. Stanley responded to Defendants' email confirming the same. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶2.

15 *Substantial harm or prejudice without modification.* As explained above, an immediate ruling
 16 on the underlying dispute is necessary to prevent further dissemination and use of confidential
 17 information in violation of the Protective Order. Notably, Mr. Stanley and other plaintiffs' counsel
 18 using the confidential information to issue discovery requests have defended their conduct, in part, on
 19 the grounds that the MDL court has not yet ruled on the issue. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶20.

20 Identification of Defendants' internal company policy related resources, and the homepages
 21 into which these resources are organized, effectively creates a roadmap of Defendants' information
 22 infrastructure. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶21. The organization of these resources into homepages reveals
 23 the way each resource is used within the business, including what resources are available to what
 24 personnel. *Id.* Defendants developed their information infrastructure over a long period of time at
 25 significant cost. *Id.* Knowledge of these resources is even restricted within Defendants by roles and
 26 responsibilities within the business. *Id.* Thus, the continued use and disclosure of the confidential
 27 information is causing ongoing harm. The ongoing violations are also violating and undermining the

1 Protective Order.

2 *Nature of the underlying dispute and the parties' positions.* As explained above, Mr. Stanley
 3 is violating the Protective Order. The Protective Order defines "Protected Material" as material
 4 designated Confidential or Highly Confidential/AEO. ECF 176, ¶2.16. The Protective Order "cover[s]
 5 not only Protected Material" but also "any information copied or extracted from Protected Material,"
 6 and "all copies, *excerpts, summaries, or compilations* of Protected Material," and any
 7 "conversations...by Parties or their Counsel that might reveal Protected Material." ECF 176, ¶3
 8 (emphasis added). Mr. Stanley admitted that he created the October 2024 Spreadsheet from MDL
 9 documents designated as Confidential and Highly Confidential/AEO. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶¶6-8.
 10 Therefore, Mr. Stanley is not permitted to use the October 2024 Spreadsheet to prosecute other cases
 11 or disclose it other than as allowed by the Protective Order.

12 Mr. Stanley and the PSC contend that the information on the October 2024 Spreadsheet is not
 13 confidential because policy names are not confidential. However, Mr. Stanley and the PSC confirmed
 14 during the conferral that they are not contending that any particular document was improperly
 15 designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential/AEO by Defendants.

16 *Previous time modifications.* The parties have agreed to depart from the ordinary timelines set
 17 out in the Local Rules as agreed or ordered by the Court. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶23.

18 *Effect of the requested modification.* Expedited briefing on this issue would not impact any
 19 other deadlines in this case. Ex. A, Gromada Dec., ¶22.

20
 21 DATED: July 18, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

22 **SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.**

23 By: /s/ Michael B. Shortnacy

24 MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY

25 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**

26 ALLISON M. BROWN

27 JESSICA DAVIDSON

28 LAURA VARTAIN HORN

O'MELVENY AND MYERS LLP
SABRINA H. STRONG
JONATHAN SCHNELLER

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
ALYCIA A. DEGEN
MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY
PATRICK L. OOT, JR.
CHRISTOPHER V. COTTON

Attorneys for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
RASIER, LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC